specification.

In support thereof, it is firstly noted that antecedent base for the term "impurity region" in claims 35 and 36 is provided in the corresponding independent claims 2 and 5, respectively. Specifically, the impurity region is recited as being interposed between the channel regions. This technical feature, as disclosed in claims 35 and 36, can readily be found in, at least, FIG. 1 of Applicant's drawings. As described in Applicant's originally filed specification, the impurity region which is interposed between the channel regions corresponds to item 15b, 16 and 15c, where the channel regions correspond to items 17a and 17b (e.g., see paragraph [0046]). FIG. 1 illustrates that the top surface of the impurity region is in contact with the gate insulating film (item 18). The top view shown in FIG. 2 also evidences this technical feature. Namely, the region which is in the semiconductor film of the first thin film transistor and is interposed between the gate electrode 19a and 19b is the impurity region. As seen in FIG. 2, no electrical connection is provided over this region, which means that the top surface of the impurity region is entirely in contact with the gate insulating film. Accordingly, this technical feature is believed to be clearly evidenced and supported. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection under U.S.C. 35 §112 is respectfully requested.

On pages 2 to 11 of the instant Office Action, claims of the instant application stand provisionally rejected on grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of co-pending applications 10/980,603, 10/337,391, 10/333,391, and 11/258,933, and in view of Luo (U.S. Patent No. 4,040,073). Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be held in abeyance until all prior art rejections are overcome. In addition, Applicant believes that line 3 on page 8 of the Office Action contains a typographical error in that Application No. "10/333,391" should read –10/337,391–. Applicant requests that the Examiner confirm the correct co-pending Application No.

Claims 2-4, 20-24, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,213, hereinafter Sasaki). Claims 5-8, 9-11, 25-26, and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Luo. Claims 35, 38-39, 41, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Ozawa et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2006/0279491, hereinafter Ozawa). Claims 36, 37, 40, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sasaki in view of Luo and in further view of Ozawa. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons:

As stated in the Examiner's RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS section, the Examiner purports that the LCD "inherently uses an electroluminescence element that is connected to the display device." While it has been known in general that LCD devices can use electroluminescence panels, it is noted that the electroluminescent element is claimed to be electrically connected to the second thin film transistor which is provided in each of the plurality of pixels, as recited in Applicant's claims. Sasaki, cited by the Examiner, does not teach the particulars of this claimed technical feature. Furthermore, Luo and Ozawa also fail to disclose or fairly suggest this claimed technical feature. Thus, for example, the combination of Sasaki with Luo cannot show all of the claim elements, since Luo was used to show the relationship between the channel width and the channel length. Ozawa has similar problems in that there is no disclosure of the claimed technical feature to cure the deficiencies of Sasaki and/or Sasaki in view of Luo. Hence, the current rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is not properly constructed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (M.P.E.P. 706.02). Since each and every element, as set forth in the claims are not found either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P., Sasaki

cannot be said to anticipate the invention as claimed. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sasaki, Luo, nor Ozawa, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in the claims. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, each of the dependent claims also recites combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicant in no way intends to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned patent agent at (202) 585-8316.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Marc W. Butler, Reg. #50,219/
Marc W. Butler
Registration No. 50,219

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080